1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

PERCY LAVAE BACON,

Plaintiff,

VS.

DAVID ROGER,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:11-CV-00406-RLH-(PAL)

ORDER

Plaintiff has submitted a motion to alter or amend judgment (#3). He asks the court to reconsider its denial of his application to proceed <u>in forma pauperis</u> (#1) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The court found that on at least three occasions it had dismissed actions brought by petitioner for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Order (#2). Petitioner claims that none of the three cases the court cited should be counted against him.

The court is not persuaded by petitioner's argument that he did not seek leave to proceed <u>in forma pauperis</u> in either <u>Bacon v. Webster</u>, 2:05-CV-01267-PMP-(GWF), or <u>Bacon v. State of Nevada</u>, 2:10-CV-01451-KJD-(LRL). <u>Bacon v. Webster</u> was removed to this court from state court, and this court dismissed it for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. <u>Bacon v. State of Nevada</u> was dismissed for failure to state a claim even though plaintiff had not filed an application to proceed <u>in forma pauperis</u>. Section 1915(g) does not require that plaintiff proceeded <u>in forma pauperis</u> in his prior actions, it just requires that the prior actions be dismissed for being frivolous, for being malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Because both of those actions were dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief

Case 2:11-cv-00406-RLH-PAL Document 4 Filed 04/20/11 Page 2 of 3

can be granted, and because plaintiff's attempts to obtain relief from those judgments were unsuccessful both in this court and on appeal, these dismissals qualify as prior dismissals for the purposes of § 1915(g).

The court also is not persuaded by petitioner's argument that <u>Bacon v. Laswell</u>, 2:09-CV-2058-PMP-(PAL), was opened in error. Petitioner argues that the complaint in <u>Bacon v. Laswell</u> should have been filed as an amended complaint in <u>Bacon v. Webster</u>. This argument is faulty for three reasons. First, the court entered final judgment in <u>Bacon v. Webster</u> on February 22, 2006, more than three years before the court received the complaint in <u>Bacon v. Laswell</u> on October 23, 2009. Plaintiff could not reopen the action on his own. Second, plaintiff did not ask the court at that time to reopen <u>Bacon v. Webster</u>. Third, nothing on the complaint in <u>Bacon v. Laswell</u> indicated that it should have been filed in <u>Bacon v. Webster</u>, and the clerk of the court does not evaluate allegations to determine in what action a pleading should be filed. Because <u>Bacon v. Laswell</u> was dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and because plaintiff's attempts to obtain relief from the judgment were unsuccessful both in this court and on appeal, this dismissal qualifies as a prior dismissals for the purposes of § 1915(g).

With three prior dismissals for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, plaintiff will need to pay the filing fee in full pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and his motion to alter or amend judgment (#3) is without merit.

///

20 ///

21 | ///

22 ///

23 ///

2.7

¹After the court dismissed <u>Bacon v. Laswell</u>, plaintiff did file in <u>Bacon v. Webster</u> a motion to amend the complaint and a motion to set aside the judgment. The court denied those motions, and the court of appeals dismissed his appeal. The motions filed in <u>Bacon v. Webster</u> have no effect upon the dismissal of <u>Bacon v. Laswell</u>.

Case 2:11-cv-00406-RLH-PAL Document 4 Filed 04/20/11 Page 3 of 3

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to alter or amend judgment

(#3) is **DENIED**. Plaintiff shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of entry of this order to pay

the filing fee in full.

DATED: April 20, 2011.

ROGER L'HUNT
Chief United States District Judge

-3-